

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-41 and 43-60, of which claims 43-56 are withdrawn, are presently pending in the application. In the present amendment claims 1, 2, 10, 13 and 57, are amended, withdrawn claims 43-56 are cancelled without prejudice and new claim 60 is added. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 20, 21, 26-41 and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,653,706 to Zavislan et al.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the imaging subsystem "generates images of a region of the skin and determines responsive to the images if the region comprises a feature on the skin to be treated and if so, a location of the feature in the region". The amendment makes explicit what is implicit in the unamended version of the claim, that *it is the imaging system that determines whether or not a region of the skin has a feature to be treated* and if the region has a feature to be treated where in the region the feature is located. Support for the amendment is found throughout the application, e.g. page 12 lines 14-24, Fig. 1B and discussion thereof.

Applicants submit that Zavislan does not comprise an imaging system that makes a determination as to whether or not a region comprises a given feature, or an imaging system that has any autonomous capacity for making such a determination and that therefore Zavislan does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Claim 2 is amended to replace "optics" which has no antecedent with the word "subsystem".

Claim 10 is amended to delete the word "area", which has no antecedent, and redraft the claim accordingly.

Claim 13 is amended to recite that the imaging system comprises at least one photosensitive surface, which has no antecedent when the claim is dependent on claim 1, and to conform the claim with terminology of amended claim 1.

New claim 60 is supported throughout the disclosure, e.g. Fig. 1A and Fig. 2 and discussions thereof.


Claim 57 is amended similarly to claim 1, to make explicit that it is circuitry comprised in the imaging system that determines if a region of skin comprises a feature to be treated by laser light. Amended claim 57 is therefore not anticipated by Zavislan for the same reasons that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Zavislan.

153/01963 A04

In view of the above remarks applicant feels that independent claims 1 and 57, the only independent claims in the amended claim set, are patentable and that all the dependent claims in the claim set are patentable, either through dependence on claim 1 or 57 or because of patentable limitations that they recite.

An action on the merits is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,
U. SHARON


Allan C. Entis
Reg. No. 52,866

May 27, 2004
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: (212) 521-5400